

REMARKS

The Amendment, filed in response to the Office Action mailed July 7, 2011, is believed to be fully responsive to the rejections contained therein. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8-11 are pending in the current application and are examined on the merits herein. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8-11 are rejected and claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 11 are objected to.

In the current Amendment, claim 8 is amended to include full names of the recited active ingredients and claim 11 is amended to correct the dependency in view of cancellation of claim 1. Claims 1-5 and 9-10 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

No new matter is introduced. Entry and consideration of the Amendment are respectfully requested.

Response to Claim Objections

In the Office Action, claim 1, 2, 4, 5 and 11 are objected to because of the typographical error "range of 1:01-1:10" on line 4 of claim 1, which should be corrected to "range of 1:0.1-1:10."

Claim 1 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the objection moot.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Claims 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Without conceding with the rejection, solely for the interests of Applicants to advance the prosecution, Applicants cancel claims 2, 4, and 5 rendering the rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoo et al. (EP 1327434: published July 2003; cited by Applicant in Information Disclosure Statement submitted 01 July 2009) in view of Ahn et al. (KR10-2003-0075492: published September 2003; machine translation cited in PTO-892) and Park et al. (KR10-2003-0064986: published August 2003; machine translation cited in previous Office Action) as evidenced by Lee et al. (J. of Invest. Dermat., cited in previous Office Actions).

Applicants respectfully traverse.

As discussed above, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10 are canceled, rendering the rejections of these claims moot.

With regard to claims 8 and 11, none of the references, in combinations, teach or suggest an inhibitor of Rb protein dephosphorylation as defined in claim 8. Therefore, the rejection is not sustainable and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Response to Provisional Obviousness-type Double Patenting

I. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 6 and 7 of copending Application No. 10/586973 in view of Yoo et al. (cited above) and Ahn et al. (cited above).

II. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16 and 18-21 of copending Application No. 11/443271 in view of Yoo et al. (cited above) and Ahn et al. (cited above).

III. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7-10 of copending Application No. 12/135,663 in view of Yoo et al. (cited above) and Ahn et al. (cited above).

IV. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12- 23 of copending Application No. 12/740212 in view of Yoo et al. (cited above) and Ahn et al. (cited above).

Applicants respectfully request the provisional rejections be held in abeyance until any allowable subject matter is identified.

Please amend Claim 1 by limiting ‘a skin-care composition’ to ‘an inhibitor of Rb protein dephosphorylation’, which is the feature of Claim 8, and please delete Claims 8-10.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sunhee Lee/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Sunhee Lee
Registration No. 53,892

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 7, 2011